arXiv:1512.02180v5 [math.AP] 27 Nov 2016

Multi-dimensional Low Regularity Observability Estimates

Alden Waters*

November 29, 2016

Abstract

We prove observability estimates for n-dimensional wave equations with non-Lipschitz coefficients. For Lipschitz and Zygmund-regular coefficients our result extends the well-known observability estimate for smooth coefficients. When the coefficients obey a log-Lipschitz or log-Zygmund condition, we prove observability estimates with a loss of derivatives. This work generalizes previous results by Fanelli / Zuazua (2015) in dimension 1 and introduces new techniques for low regularity Ansatzes involving ray-tracing.

keywords: control theory, inverse problems, wave equations, observability, low regularity coefficients, Gaussian beams

MSC classes: 35R01, 35R30, 35L20, 58J45, 35A22

1 Introduction

Significant interest in inverse problems and imaging centers around low-regularity wave equations. Often times in nature equations governing physical situations can be irregular and discontinuities are difficult to model. Ray tracing techniques used in geophysics often require C^2 coefficients to model the physical phenomenon. These techniques have been popular with the inverse problems community [1, 19, 20, 29, 30, 34, 35]. The goal of this article is to introduce a construction which generalizes the Gaussian beam Ansatz and is suitable for proving multi-dimensional observability estimates for the weakest type of regularity possible. We demonstrate the relationship of these observability estimates to hyperbolic inverse boundary value problems and the geodesic X-ray transform. Our results indicate that in some cases, for practical applications imaging is still possible. The main theorems extend the observability estimates of [12] both in dimension and generality of the geometry. We assume a condition on

*Department of Mathematics, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

the manifolds which is related to the observability criterion of Bardos-Lebeau-Rauch, [3]. We give some applications to the study of inverse problems and the relationship to the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.

Specifically, we prove in this paper observability estimates for n-dimensional classical wave equations with non-Lipschitz coefficients. Whenever the coefficients are in a Lipschitz or Zygmund class we establish observability estimates which we relate to inverse problems. When the coefficients are in a log-Lipschitz or log-Zygmund class we show observability estimates with loss of derivatives. We generalize the work of [12] to close the gap between the Lipschitz case where observability estimates hold in energy space to the Holder case when they fail at all finite orders corresponding to an infinite loss of derivatives. We also provide an outline of how to generalize the Ansatz constructed to obtain the same results but with coefficients lying in the space of integral Zygmund coefficients.

These estimates are proved for one-dimensional wave equations by means of a uniquely one-dimensional technique [12] called sidewise energy estimates where the use of space and time are interchanged. We use a weighted variant of the X-ray transform where the use of time and arc-length are interchanged which was developed in [38]. This development seems like a natural generalization of sidewise energy estimates.

In higher space dimensions the problem is more complex and other techniques are required. Bardos-Lebeau-Rauch [3] proved it is necessary and sufficient for observability estimates to hold for wave equation coefficients if the observability region $\Theta \subset \mathcal{M}$ satisfies the geometric control condition. In one dimension, rays can only travel in a sidewise manner, so this condition is automatic to verify. However for the higher dimensional case the development of more complex Ansatzes to trace the ray path in space-time involves C^2 [31] or at minimum $C^{1,1}$ [37] coefficients. The main novelty of this paper is an Ansatz which does not require the usual C^2 coefficients necessary for the construction of the localized tail. The development of the Ansatz is similar to the one used to construct quasimodes in [9], the major difference being that the operators considered in [9] are all smooth.

For the system in question, the observability estimates are known to be verified in 1d when the coefficients are in bounded variation class, see [13]. Observability estimates with a loss of derivatives continue to hold for coefficients in log-Zygmund spaces [12], but fail for C^α [8] with $\alpha < 1$. In higher dimensions, Burq extended the observability estimates to C^2 coefficients and C^3 domains [7]. We generalize the work of [12] for less regular coefficients. From a counter-example in the work of [12], we know that bounded variation is sharp for observability estimates to hold in one dimension. For this work, we concentrate on results in the positive direction, and use an equivalent hypothesis on the geometry of the rays as in [7]. We will provide counter-examples in a forthcoming article.

We chose to build a modification of a Gaussian beam construction for the Schrodinger equation and pass to the wave equation using a modification of the Laplace transform. Gaussian beams are asymptotically valid high frequency solutions to hyperbolic differential equations which are concentrated on a single

physical curve in the domain. One can extend them to dispersive equations such as the Schrodinger equation. Superpositions of Gaussian beams also provide a powerful tool to generate more general high frequency solutions which are not necessarily concentrated on a single curve. We present a systematic construction of Gaussian beam super-positions for the Schrodinger equation. Geometric optics breaks down at caustics where the rays concentrate and the predicted amplitude is unbounded. The consideration of such difficulties which are caused by caustics starting with Keller [22] and then Maslov and Fedoriuk [26] which leads to the development of Fourier integral operators given by Hormander [16]. We use a modification of the construction which is related to the Laplace transform in order to generate solutions which are concentrated along curves in the high frequency regime which model the X-ray transform.

2 Notational conventions

The Einstein summation convention is used throughout this article. We write $f \sim g$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $C^{-1} f \leq g \leq Cf$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth manifold with boundary and denote by $(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^n})$ a basis of tangent vector fields. The inner product and norm on the tangent space $T_x\mathcal{M}$ are denoted by

$$g(X,Y) = \langle X, Y \rangle_g = g_{jk}\alpha_j\beta_k, \qquad |X|_g = \langle X, X \rangle_g^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $X = \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $Y = \beta_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$. The gradient of $f \in C^1(\mathcal{M})$ is defined as the vector field $\nabla_g f$ such that

$$X(f) = \langle \nabla_g f, X \rangle_g$$

for all vector fields X on $\mathcal{M}$. In local coordinates, we can write

$$\nabla_g f = g^{ij} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}.$$

The metric tensor induces a Riemannian volume form, which we denote by

$$d_g V = (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge dx_n$$

with corresponding surface form $d_g\sigma$.

The space $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is the completion of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ with respect to the inner product

$$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{M}} f_1(x) f_2(x)\, d_g V\ , \qquad f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{M}).$$

Sobolev spaces are defined analogously to the Euclidean Sobolev spaces, with the norm

$$||f||^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} = ||f||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + ||\nabla f||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\,.$$

We let $\nu = \nu(x)$ be the outer unit normal to $\partial\mathcal{M}$ at x in $\partial\mathcal{M}$ which we normalize so we have

$$g^{kl}(x)\nu_k(x)\nu_l(x) = 1.$$

We now introduce the definition of the X-ray transform on $\mathcal{M}$. For $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\omega \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ we write $\gamma_{x,\omega}$ for the unique geodesic with initial conditions

$$\gamma_{x,\omega}(0) = x, \qquad \dot{\gamma}_{x,\omega}(0) = \omega.$$

We let

$$\mathcal{SM} = \{(x,\omega) \in T\mathcal{M}; \quad |\omega|_g = 1\} \tag{2.1}$$

denote the sphere bundle of $\mathcal{M}$. The submanifold of inner vectors of $\mathcal{SM}$ is given by

$$\partial_+\mathcal{SM} = \{(x,\omega) \in \mathcal{SM}, \quad x \in \partial\mathcal{M}, \quad +\langle\omega, \nu(x)\rangle < 0\}.$$

Let $\tau(x,\omega)$ be the length of the geodesic segment with initial conditions $(x,\omega) \in \partial_+\mathcal{SM}$. We consider the inward pointing vectors of $\mathcal{SM}$ only.

The construction of the Gaussian beam Ansatz requires us to make a further assumption on $\mathcal{M}$:

Assumption 1. *There is a $T > 0$ such that the following holds: For all $(x,\omega) \in \partial_+\mathcal{SM}$ there is a $\tau(x,\omega) \leq T$ such that $\gamma_{x,\omega}(t)$ is in the interior of $\mathcal{M}$ for $0 < t < \tau(x,\omega)$, and intersects the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ transversally when $t = \tau(x,\omega)$.*

This hypothesis is the weakest assumption on the geometry for the Gaussian beam Ansatz to be well-defined in our setting. It is related to the geometric control condition of [3]. This was also observed in [2]. The assumption is equivalent to the 'rayon non-captif' (non-captive rays) hypothesis in [7]. Using the terminology of [7] we are avoiding gliding rays and captive rays. In [7], a counter example shows that without this hypothesis control may not be possible. We concentrate on establishing observability estimates under the non-captive rays hypothesis and report on counter-examples in future work.

We now define the X-ray transform of a time-dependent, sufficiently smooth function $f(t,x)$ as follows:

$$I_{x,\omega}f = \int_0^{\tau(x,\omega)} f(s, \gamma_{x,\omega}(s))\, ds. \tag{2.2}$$

The right hand side of (2.2) is a smooth function on the space $\partial_+\mathcal{SM}$, because $\tau(x,\omega)$ is a smooth function on $\partial_+\mathcal{SM}$.

3 Statement of the Main Results

Because this paper is devoted to proving boundary observability estimates for multi-dimensional wave equations with non-Lipschitz coefficients, we need to define the generalization of the notion of observability estimates in [12]. We study a broader class of wave equations than those found in [12] in order to consider compact Riemannian manifolds which satisfy a condition similar to the one found in [38].

We let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth manifold with metric g and smooth boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, satisfying assumption 1. However for most of this article, it will only be necessary for the metric to be C^3 for the construction of the Ansatz. We are considering the n-dimensional wave equation

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(x)\partial_t^2 u - \Delta_g u = 0 \qquad & \text{in} \qquad [0,T]\times\mathcal{M}\ , \\ u(t,x) = 0 \qquad & \text{in} \qquad [0,T]\times\partial\mathcal{M}\ , \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x),\quad \partial_t u(0,x) = u_1(x) \qquad & \text{in} \qquad \mathcal{M}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Here Δ_g denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det g(x)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}\left(g^{ki}(x)\sqrt{\det g(x)}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

in local coordinates, with $g(x) = (g_{ik}(x))$, and $(g^{ik}(x)) = (g_{ki}(x))^{-1}$.

The coefficient α satisfies the strict hyperbolicity conditions. In other words, there exist α_*, α^* such that $0 \le \alpha_* \le \alpha(x) \le \alpha^*$. Under these hypotheses, we know that the equation (3.1) is well-posed in $H_0^1(\mathcal{M}) \times L^2(\mathcal{M})$ for initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in H_0^1(\mathcal{M}) \times L^2(\mathcal{M})$, and there exists a unique solution u to (3.1) such that $u \in C([0,T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{M})) \cap C^1([0,1]; L^2(\mathcal{M}))$. Moreover, the energy

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \alpha(x)|\partial_t u|^2 + |\nabla_g u|^2 \, d_g V \tag{3.3}$$

is preserved under evolution in time [8, 18]. A localized Ansatz for low regularity metrics g would be much more difficult to construct.

Since the solution is well-posed, we can introduce the problem of recovering the source from normal derivative. The normal derivative of the solution u is given by

$$\partial_\nu u(t,x) = \nabla_g u(t,x)\cdot\nu(x) = g^{jk}(x)\nu_j \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k}(t,x) \tag{3.4}$$

The way we are setting up this problem, control will correspond to the Dirichlet-to-Neumann problem. In this context, the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is a bit of a misnomer, we mean the normal derivative of the solution to the wave equation associated to the data set. Typically the operator is defined for boundary value data. However, the normal operator is well defined as a trace class operator as the problem is well posed [10].

The dynamical Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, Λ_g, is defined by

$$\Lambda_g u(0,x) = \nu_k(x) g^{kl}(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_l}(t,x)|_{((0,T)\times\partial\mathcal{M})}.$$

We know Λ_g is bounded as a linear operator into $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ whenever $u_0(x)$ is in $H_0^1(\mathcal{M})$, $u_1(x)$ is in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$. We can consider arbitrary initial data with these criterion, and then we know the measurements are well-posed.

We associate to the problem (3.1) the time

$$T_\alpha = \sup_\gamma \int_\gamma \sqrt{\alpha(\gamma(s))}\, ds \tag{3.5}$$

where the supremum extends over all maximally extended geodesics in $\mathcal{M}$.

We begin with the definitions of the multi-dimensional Lipschitz and Zygmund classes.

Now we have the following definition

Definition 1 (Definition 2.7 in [12])**.** *A function $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is log-Lipschitz continuous, and we write $f \in LL(\mathbb{R}^n)$, if the quantity*

$$|f|_{LL,\infty} = \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n, |y|<1} \left(\frac{|f(x+y)-f(x)|}{|y|\log(1+1/|y|)} \right) < \infty\ . \tag{3.6}$$

We also set

$$||f||_{LL} = ||f||_{L^\infty} + |f|_{LL,\infty}. \tag{3.7}$$

Definition 2. *A function $g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is log-Zygmund continuous and we write $g \in LZ(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if*

$$|g|_{LZ,\infty} = \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n, |y|<1} \left(\frac{|g(x+y)+g(x-y)-2g(x)|}{|y|\log\left(1+\frac{1}{|y|}\right)} \right) < \infty\ . \tag{3.8}$$

The function g is Zygmund continuous, $g \in Z(\mathbb{R}^n)$, if

$$|g|_{Z,\infty} = \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n, |y|<1} \left(\frac{|g(x+y)+g(x-y)-2g(x)|}{|y|} \right) < \infty. \tag{3.9}$$

We also set

$$||f||_Z = ||f||_{L^\infty} + |f|_{Z,\infty}$$
$$||f||_{LZ} = ||f||_{L^\infty} + |f|_{LZ,\infty}.$$

We define

$$\kappa_{LZ} = \kappa_{LL}(y) = |y|\log\left(1+\frac{1}{|y|}\right) \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\kappa_Z(y) = |y| \tag{3.11}$$

corresponding to the modulus of continuity in the definitions. These moduli will help in later computations. All of the theorems are formulated under the additional hypotheses that $\mathcal{M}$ satisfy some conditions for the X-ray transform to be stable or injective. We assume there is a constant $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\nabla_g(x\alpha(x)) \geq \alpha_0$, in the sense of distributions. (The case $\nabla_g(x\alpha(x)) = 0$ is also possible with a bit more work). This condition is enough to imply the geometric control condition of Bardos-Lebeau-Rauch, [3], with respect to the conformal Laplacian $\alpha^{-1}(x)\Delta_g$. All of the theorems are formulated modulo a kernel which is smoother.

For the first theorem we assume $\alpha(x)$ is Zygmund continuous. This theorem is the analogue of Theorem 1.1 in [12] in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For this theorem we assume g is Euclidean and $\mathcal{M}$ is the unit ball:

Theorem 1. *Assume $T > 2T_\alpha$, that α satisfies (3.9) and $(u_0, u_1) \in H_0^1(\mathcal{M}) \times L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then there exists a constant C, which depends on T, α_0, α_*, α^* and $|\alpha|_{Z,\infty}$, such that*

$$||u_0||^2_{H_0^1(\mathcal{M})} + ||u_1||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\,||\partial_\nu u||^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\partial\mathcal{M})} \tag{3.12}$$

Here ∂_ν denotes the operator associated to (3.1), and g is the Euclidean metric.

The version for simple manifolds

Theorem 2. *Assume $T > 2T_\alpha$, that α satisfies (3.9) and $(u_0, u_1) \in H_0^1(\mathcal{M}) \times L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then there exists a constant C, which depends on T,α_0 α_*, α^* and $|\alpha|_{Z,\infty}$ such that*

$$||u_0||^2_{H_0^1(\mathcal{M})} + ||u_1||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\,||\partial_\nu u||^2_{L^2((0,T)\times\partial\mathcal{M})} \tag{3.13}$$

Here ∂_ν denotes the operator associated to (3.1).

Remark 1. *In [12], $\partial\mathcal{M} = \partial([0,1]) = \{0,1\}$, so there is no integral over the boundary in Theorem 1.1 of [12] but in the above case there is by dimension counting. Moreover they use a relaxed integral formulation of the Zygmund condition which is discussed.*

We define the map

$$D_\alpha : f \mapsto \frac{1}{\alpha(x)}\Delta_g f. \tag{3.14}$$

We denote D_α^k as the composition $D_\alpha \circ ... \circ D_\alpha$ for any $k > 0$.

We also prove for the sphere (with an analogous version simple manifolds)

Theorem 3. *Assume $T > 2T_\alpha$, that α satisfies (3.8), and $u_0 \in H^{2m+1}(\mathcal{M}) \cap H_0^1(\mathcal{M})$, $u_1 \in H^{2m}(\mathcal{M})$ with $D_\alpha^m u_0 \in H^1(\mathcal{M})$ and $D_\alpha^m u_1 \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then there exist constants C and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, which depend only on α_0 α_*,α^* and $|\alpha|_{LL}$, resp. $|\alpha|_{LZ}$ such that*

$$||u_0||^2_{H_0^1(\mathcal{M})} + ||u_1||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\,||\partial_\nu(\partial_t^m u)||^2_{L^2([0,T]\times\partial\mathcal{M})}\,. \tag{3.15}$$

4 Fermi coordinates

Let Γ be a geodesic in an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold. We fix an arc-length parametrization $\gamma(r)$ of Γ. We consider geodesics $\gamma(r)$ on $\mathcal{M}$ with initial conditions $(x,\omega) \in \partial\mathcal{SM}^+$. We denote the basis of the tangent space at the point x by $\{\dot\gamma(0), v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ where $v_2, \dots, v_n$ are orthonormal. We then fix a parallel orthogonal frame $E_2(r), \dots, E_n(r)$ to the normal bundle $N\Gamma$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Parallel transport then implies that $E_2(r), \dots, E_n(r)$ are orthogonal along the whole curve. We define a map $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathcal{M}$ as

$$F : (r, x') \mapsto \exp_{\gamma(r)}(x_2E_2 + ... + x_nE_n) \tag{4.1}$$

As indices we use $j,k,l \in \{2,\dots,n\}$, $\alpha,\beta,\delta \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, and we denote $X_\alpha = F_\star(\partial_{x_\alpha})$. The geodesic distance is $|x'| = \sqrt{x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2}$, and ∂_r is the outward normal to to the hypersurfaces $\{x : d_g(x,\Gamma) = C\}$, C a constant. Coordinates are the represented as (r,x') with $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. The set $\{x : d_g(x,\Gamma) = C\}$ is a geodesic tube. Indeed if we let $p = F(r,0)$, $q = F(r,x')$ and $|x'|^2 = d_g^2(p,q)$, then we have, cf. [14],

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{jk}(q) &= \delta_{jk} + \frac{1}{3}g(R(X_s,X_j)X_l,X_k)x_sx_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^3)\\
g_{1k}(q) &= \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2)\\
g_{11}(q) &= 1 - g(R(X_k,X_0)X_l,X_l)_px_kx_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^3)\\
\Gamma^\delta_{\alpha\beta} &= \mathcal{O}(|x'|)\\
\Gamma^k_{11} &= -\sum_{j=1}^n g(R(X_k,X_0)X_j,X_0)x_j + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2)\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the Schwarz Christoffel symbols are given by

$$\Gamma^\delta_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}g^{\delta\eta}(X_\alpha g_{\eta\beta} + X_\beta g_{\alpha\eta} - X_\eta g_{\alpha\beta}).$$

and R denotes the curvature tensor. It follows easily that

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{jk}|_\Gamma &= \delta_{jk}\ , \qquad \partial_i g_{jk}|_\Gamma = 0\ ,\\
g_{1k}|_\Gamma &= 0\ , \qquad\quad g_{11}|_\Gamma = 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

For example, see the computations done in [14] or Lemma 3.5 in [6].

We now quote the following lemmas from the appendix in [38]. These are originally adapted from Lemmas 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 in [21].

Lemma 1. *Let $(\mathcal{S}_0, g_0)$ be a Riemannian manifold without boundary, and let $\gamma : (a,b) \to \mathcal{S}_0$ be a unit speed geodesic segment. Then there are only finitely many points $r \in (a,b)$ at which the geodesic $\gamma(r)$ intersects itself.*

We also have by the inverse function theorem:

Lemma 2. *Let F be a C^1 map from a neighborhood of $[a_0, b_0] \times \{0\} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ into a smooth manifold such that F restricted to $[a_0, b_0] \times \{0\}$ is injective and $DF(r, 0)$ is invertible whenever $r \in [a_0, b_0]$ Then F is a C^1 diffeomorphism in some neighborhood of $[a_0, b_0] \times \{0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Finally

Lemma 3. *Let $(\mathcal{S}_0, g_0)$ be a Riemannian manifold without boundary, and let $\gamma : (a, b) \to \mathcal{S}_0$ be a unit speed geodesic segment. Given a closed subinterval $[a_0, b_0]$ of (a, b) such that $\gamma|_{[a_0,b_0]}$ self-intersects at only finitely many points, r_j, with $a_0 < r_1 < ... < r_L = b_0$. There is an open cover $\{O_l, \rho_l\}$ of $\gamma([a_0, b_0])$ of coordinate charts with the following properties*

1. *$\rho_l(O_l) = \mathcal{U}_l$.*
2. *$\rho_l(\gamma(r)) = (r, 0) \qquad \forall r \in (r_l - \epsilon, r_l + \epsilon)$.*
3. *r_l belongs to I_l and $\overline{I_l} \cap \overline{I_j} = \emptyset$ unless $|l - j| \leq 1$.*
4. *$\rho_l = \rho_k$ on $\rho_l^{-1}(O_l \cap O_k)$.*

In particular we have $\rho = F^{-1}$.

We let

$$\bigcup_{l=0}^{L} (t_l - \epsilon_1, t_l + \epsilon_1) \times O_l \tag{4.3}$$

be a cover of the graph $\{(t, x(t)) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. Here ϵ_1 is defined as the minimal radius of the open set such that Lemma 2 holds all along the geodesic. By construction, there is a disjoint union of sets $(t_l, t_{l+1}) \times \tilde{O}_l$ whose union is

$$\{(t, x) : |t - t_0| + d_g(x, x(r)) < 2\epsilon_1;\, 0 \leq r \leq T\}\ , \tag{4.4}$$

such that $|t_l - t_{l+1}|, \mathrm{diam}_g(\tilde{O}_l) \leq 2\epsilon_1$. Then we know that $(t_l - \epsilon, t_l + \epsilon) \times \mathcal{U}_l$ can be identified with $(t_l - \epsilon_1, t + \epsilon_1) \times O_l$. We then can build a Gaussian beam U_l in every open set $\mathcal{U}_l$ by considering its pre-image in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the open set $\tilde{O}_l$. This construction is possible, since we know locally in each coordinate chart $x(t)$ corresponds to $\gamma(t)$. We will construct the solutions in the next section.

Let $h > 0$ be a scalar, which we take to be small. We define $\chi_l(t, x) = \chi_h(x - x(t))\tilde{\chi}_l(t)$ where

$$\chi_l(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad t \in [t_l, t_{l+1}] \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad t \in [2t_l, 2t_{l+1}]^c \end{cases}. \tag{4.5}$$

Here $\chi_h(x - x(t))$ is a cutoff which is defined in a neighborhood of the tube (4.4), such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi_h(z) \geq 0 \\ &\chi_h(z) = 1 \quad |z| \leq h^{1/n}, \\ &\chi_h(z) = 0 \quad |z| \geq 2h^{1/n} \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

as per [24] equation (13). We then construct individual Gaussian beams $U_l(t,x)$ across local coordinate charts by taking the initial data for the beam $U(0,x) = U_{l-1}(t_l,x)$ and cutting the Gaussian beam off with $\chi_l(t,x)$. We suppress the cutoff in the next sections where it is understood.

5 Construction of the Ansatz

We consider the following evolution equation

$$\begin{aligned} ih\partial_t u &= \frac{1}{2}h^2\Delta_g u \ , \\ u(x,0) &= f(x) \in H_0^1(\mathcal{M}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

It is formally associated to the Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2}g^{ij}(x)p_ip_j$. Ultimately we will take $f(x) = A(x)\exp(i\Phi(x)/h)$ with $A(x) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M};\mathbb{R})$ and $\Phi(x) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M};\mathbb{C})$. In order to construct an asymptotic solution to (5.1), we start with the approximation

$$U(t,x) = a(t,x)\exp\left(ih^{-1}\psi(t,x)\right) \ . \tag{5.2}$$

The functions are differentiable and this construction is feasible because the solution is concentrated on a single curve. Requiring $\psi(t,x)$ to be real-valued along the curve and complex valued away from the curve gives rise to the Gaussian beam ansatz. With this in mind we substitute (5.2) into (5.1). The substitution results in the following eikonal and transport equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t\psi(t,x) + H(x,d\psi) = 0 \ , \\ &\partial_t a(t,x) + da(t,x)\cdot\nabla_g\psi(t,x) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_g\psi(t,x)a(t,x) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

We build a Gaussian beam around central rays $\{(t,x(t)), 0 \le t \le T\}$, similar to the treatment in [40]. We define the momentum variable

$$p(t) = d_x\psi(t,x(t)) \tag{5.4}$$

and the associated Hamilton-Jacobi flow by the system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \nabla_p H(x(t),p(t)) \ , \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -\nabla_x H(x(t),p(t)) \ , \tag{5.5}$$

with initial condition $(x(0),p(0)) = (z,\eta) \in T\mathcal{M}^*$. Along the ray path $\{(t,x(t)); 0 \le t \le T\}$, the phase function satisfies the following

$$\frac{d\psi(t,x(t))}{dt} = d\psi\cdot\nabla_p H(x(t),d_x\psi(t,x(t))) - H(x(t),d_x\psi(t,x(t))) \qquad \psi(t,x) = \psi(0,x). \tag{5.6}$$

for some initial conditions $\psi(0,x)$. In particular we chose

$$\psi(0,x) = (x-z)^T \frac{i\mathrm{Id}}{2}(x-z) + (x-z)\cdot\eta \tag{5.7}$$

in Fermi-coordinates. If we examine the bicharacteristic flow, then we see that the Hamiltonian flow and the geodesic flow coincide locally in every coordinate chart by lifting. Therefore by Borel's Lemma, [16], it suffices to construct the Gaussian beams in each local coordinate chart O_j with Euclidean metric.

We claim that

Theorem 4. *For the central rays $\{(t,x(t)), 0\le t\le T\}$ there exists an approximate solution of the form (5.2) such that*

$$\|u(t,x) - U(t,x)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \le C(T)h^{(1/2+n/4)} \tag{5.8}$$

with $C(T)$ depending uniformly on T, and the $H_0^1(\mathcal{M})$ norm of the initial data $f(x) = a(0,x(0))\exp(i\psi(0,x)/h)$. The approximation (5.2) satisfies

$$\Im\psi(t,x) \ge C(t)d_g(x,x(t))^2 \ , \quad \Im\psi(t,x(t)) = 0 \ , \tag{5.9}$$

and $C(t)$ is a scalar which depends continuously on time.

In order to prove the theorem we continue with the construction of the phase, and then the amplitude, in each local Euclidean neighborhood O_j which is a pre-image of a chart $\mathcal{U}_j$. Our approximate solution $U(t,x)$ is then a superposition of Gaussian beams $U_j(t,x)$ built in each chart. We look for the second order derivative, otherwise known as the Hessian, $M(t)$ along the central ray. Expanding the phase function as a Taylor series around $x(t)$, the first two terms are given by

$$\psi^1(t,x) = (x-x(t))\cdot p(t) \ , \qquad \psi^2(t,x) = M_{lj}(t)(x-x(t))^l(x-x(t))^j \ . \tag{5.10}$$

By the choice of the Hamiltonian flow and initial conditions, we only need to show that $\Im M(t)$ is positive definite. We start by differentiating the eikonal equation to obtain the following relations:

Denoting $M_{jk}(t) = \partial^2_{x^jx^k}\psi(x(t))$, we also must have

$$-\frac{dM_{jk}(t)}{dt} = \sum_{\ell,r}\left(\partial^2_{p_\ell p_r}H(x(t),p(t))\right)M_{j\ell}(t)M_{kr}(t) \tag{5.11}$$

$$+\sum_{\ell}\left(\partial^2_{x^jp_\ell}H(x(t),p(t))M_{\ell k}(t) + \partial^2_{x^kp_\ell}H(x(t),p(t))M_{\ell j}(t)\right) \tag{5.12}$$

$$+\partial^2_{x^jx^k}H(x(t),p(t)) \tag{5.13}$$

We simplify this set of relations by introducing the matrices D, B and C with entries

$$\begin{aligned} D_{ij} &= \{H_{x^ix^j}(x(t),p(t))\} \ , \\ B_i^j &= \{H_{x^ip_j}(x(t),p(t))\} \ , \\ C^{ij} &= \{H_{p_ip_j}(x(t),p(t))\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Necessarily $M(t)$ satisfies

$$-\frac{dM}{dt} = D + BM + MB^t + MCM \ . \tag{5.15}$$

This equation is a matrix Riccati equation, which is globally well-posed if and only if $\Im M(0)$ is chosen to be positive definite. This is a standard computation in the Gaussian beam literature. A proof of this can be found in [31].

We have the following lemma on the construction of the amplitude which will also be useful later. If we work in the Euclidean coordinates, the Hamiltonian simplifies considerably.

Lemma 4. *The equation in O_j given by*

$$\frac{da(t,x(t))}{dt} = \frac{-a(t,x(t))}{2}\mathrm{tr}(H_{pp}M(t) + H_{xp}) \tag{5.16}$$

with initial condition $a(0,x(0))$ has solution:

$$a(t,x(t)) = \frac{a(0,x(0))}{\sqrt{\det(Y(t))}} \tag{5.17}$$

with $Y(t)$ which satisfies

$$\frac{dY}{dt} = H_{pp}MY + H_{px}Y \qquad Y|_{t=0} = I \tag{5.18}$$

.

Proof. The equation (5.16) can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\log a^2 = -\mathrm{tr}(H_{pp}M + H_{xp}) \tag{5.19}$$

We know from [31] that $Y(t)$ is non-singular. Let $Y(t) = S(t)D(t)S^{-1}(t)$ be the Schur decomposition. If we set

$$q(t) = \det Y(t) = \Pi_{j=1}^{d}\lambda_j \tag{5.20}$$

with $D(t) = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, ...\lambda_d)$ and if we notice that

$$\frac{dY}{dt} = S_tDS^{-1} + SD_tS^{-1} + SD(S^{-1})_t \tag{5.21}$$

we have that

$$\frac{dq}{dt} =$$
$$q\mathrm{trace}(D^{-1}D_t) = q\mathrm{trace}(SD^{-1}D_tS^{-1} + (SD^{-1})S^{-1}S_t(SD^{-1})^{-1} + (S_t^{-1})S) =$$
$$q\mathrm{trace}(Y^{-1}\frac{dY}{dt}) = q\mathrm{trace}(Y^{-1}(H_{pp}M + H_{px})Y) = q\mathrm{trace}(H_{pp}M + H_{px})$$

If we combine the previous equations we have

$$a(t) = a(0)\frac{\sqrt{q(t)}}{\sqrt{q(0)}} \tag{5.22}$$

which proves the Lemma. □

Lemma 5. *Assuming that the Hamiltonian is C^3 differentiable, then the functions constructed in* (5.10) *and* (5.17) *satisfy the eikonal and transport equations respectively*

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t\psi(t,x) + H(x, d\psi) = \mathcal{O}(d_g(x, x(t))^3 \ , \\ &\partial_t a(t,x) + da(t,x)\cdot\nabla_g\psi(t,x) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_g\psi(t,x)a(t,x) = \mathcal{O}(d_g(x,x(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Proof. This follows by direct computation of the coefficients in the Euclidean space. In this case we have the following eikonal and transport equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t\psi(t,x) + H(x, \nabla_x\psi(t,x)) = \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|^3) \\ &\partial_t a(t,x) + \nabla_p H(x,\nabla_x\psi(t,x))\cdot\nabla_x a(t,x) + \frac{a(t,x)}{2}\Delta\psi(t,x) = \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|) \end{aligned}$$

We prove the first estimate first. By construction we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}(t,x) = \\ &\frac{d\psi}{dt}(t) + \frac{dp}{dt}\cdot(x-x(t)) + p(t)\cdot\left(-\frac{dx}{dt}\right) + \\ &\frac{1}{2}(x-x(t))^T\frac{dM}{dt}(x-x(t)) - (x-x(t))^T M(t)\frac{dx}{dt} + \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|^3) \\ &\nabla_x\psi(t,x) = p(t) + M(t)(x-x(t)) + \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|^3) \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Using the Taylor series expansion of H around $x(t)$ up to the third order term we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t\psi(t,x) + H(x,\nabla_x\psi(t,x)) = \\ &\partial_t\psi(t,x) + H(x - x(t) + x(t), p(t) + M(t)(x-x(t)) = \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|^3) \end{aligned}$$

We prove the second estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t a(t,x) = a(0,x(0))(q(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}})_t = \frac{-1}{2}a(0,x)q(t)^{\frac{-3}{2}}\frac{dq}{dt} = \\ &-\frac{1}{2}a(0,x(0))q(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{tr}(H_{pp}M + H_{px}) = -\frac{a(t,x)}{2}\mathrm{tr}(H_{pp}M + H_{px}) \\ &\nabla_x a(t,x) = \mathcal{O}(|x-x(t)|) \end{aligned}$$

□

We also recall that in [25], Lemma 2.58, they derive the following identity

Lemma 6. *The identity holds*

$$(\det \Im M(t)) \, |\det Y(t)|^2 = C$$

where the constant C is independent of the time T.

We use the following well-posedness estimate from [24]

Theorem 5 (Theorem 2.1 in [24])**.** *For $U(t,x)$ a Gaussian beam solution to the Schrodinger equation, we have*

$$\|u(t,x) - U(t,x)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \|u(0,x) - U(0,x)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + Ch^{-1} \int_0^t \|P_h U(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \, d\tau \tag{5.25}$$

with P_h the semi-classical Schrodinger operator $-ih\partial_t - \frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_g$.

Proof of Theorem 4. Using Lemmas 4 and 5, then applying estimate (5.25) to $U(t,x)$ as constructed gives the desired result. Indeed, we see in each set O_j,

$$\|P_h U(t,x)\|^2_{L^2(O_j)} =$$
$$\mathcal{O}\left(\int \left(\chi_j(x)(|x - x(t)|^2 + |x - x(t)|^6) a(t,x) \right) \exp(-(x - x(t))M(t)(x - x(t))/h) \, dx \right) = \mathcal{O}(h^{n/2+1})$$

by definition of the support of $\chi_j(x)$ and Lemma 6. We could build a more accurate solution if we included more terms in the construction of $U(t,x)$ but this suffices for our purposes. □

6 Normal Operator Estimates for the Ray Transform

We want to show estimates on the ray transform in $\mathbb{R}^n$ imply estimates on the norm of f. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ we set

$$Pf(x,\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x + s\theta) \, ds. \tag{6.1}$$

We follow the same notation in [28], but note that our Pf and If coincide in Euclidean space because f is compact and the geodesics are straight lines.

The Hilbert space $L^2(T)$ is defined naturally by the inner product

$$< g, h >_{L^2(T)} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} g(\theta,x) \overline{h}(\theta,x) \, dx \, d\theta \tag{6.2}$$

The operator

$$P : L^2(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto L^2(T, (1-|x|^2)^{-1/2}) \tag{6.3}$$

is continuous if $\mathcal{M}$ is the unit ball. We define the dual operator P^* as

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int\limits_{\theta^\perp} Pf(x,\theta)\overline{g(x,\theta)}\, dx\, d\theta = \int\limits_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int\limits_{\theta^\perp} f(x,\theta)\overline{P^*g(x,\theta)}\, dx\, d\theta \tag{6.4}$$

As per [28], we define the following norm for all $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$||g||_{H^{\alpha_0}(T)} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\theta^\perp} (1+|\eta|^2)^{\frac{\alpha_0}{2}} |\hat{g}(\theta,\eta)|^2\, d\eta\, d\theta. \tag{6.5}$$

where the Fourier transform is defined by

$$\hat{f}(\eta) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp(-i\eta\cdot x) f(x)\, dx \tag{6.6}$$

For all $\alpha < n$, we define the operator X^α by

$$(X^\alpha \hat{f})(\xi) = |\xi|^{-\alpha} \hat{f}(\xi) \tag{6.7}$$

We use S to denote the Schwartz class of functions.

We have the following reconstruction formula for $f(x)$.

Theorem 6 (Theorem 2.1 in [28])**.** *If $f \in S(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have the following reconstruction formula:*

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}^{n-1}|}(2\pi)^{-1} X^{-\alpha} P^* X^{\alpha-1} g \tag{6.8}$$

with $g = Pf$, $\alpha < n$.

The monograph [28] also gives a stability estimate for functions in terms of the transform Pf. The stability estimate follows easily from the identity above.

Theorem 7. *[Theorem 2.18] For every α there are positive constants $c(\alpha, n, \mathcal{M})$ and $C(\alpha, n, \mathcal{M})$ such that for $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have that*

$$c(\alpha, n, \mathcal{M})\, ||f||_{H_0^\alpha(\mathcal{M})} \leq ||Pf||_{H^{\alpha+1/2}(T)} \leq C(\alpha, n, \mathcal{M})\, ||f||_{H_0^\alpha(\mathcal{M})} \tag{6.9}$$

For our theorems on the manifold, we need conditions for the X-ray transform to be stable. Stability conditions are easily satisfied by a class of manifolds which are simple. We review known results on simple manifolds. We define the exponential map $\exp_x : T_x\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ as follows.

$$\exp_x(v) = \gamma_{x,v}(|v|_g v) = \gamma_{xv}(rv) \quad r = |v|_g \tag{6.10}$$

We recall the following normal operator result, but first we start with the definition of the manifolds in question.

Definition 3. *We say that the Riemannian manifold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is simple if $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is strictly convex with respect to g and for any $x \in \mathcal{M}$ the exponential map*

$$\exp_x : \exp_x^{-1}(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto \mathcal{M} \tag{6.11}$$

is a surjection.

This definition necessarily implies that simple manifolds are those where the boundary is strictly convex, there are no conjugate points on any geodesic, and the manifold is non-trapping.

The Riemannian scalar product on $T_x\mathcal{M}$ induces a volume form on $\mathcal{S}_x\mathcal{M}$ which is denoted by $d\omega_x(\theta)$ and given by the alternating form

$$d\omega_x(\theta) = (-1)^k \theta^k d\theta^1 \wedge ... \wedge d\hat{\theta}^k \wedge ... \wedge d\theta^n \tag{6.12}$$

The volume form dv_g^{2n-1} on the manifold $\mathcal{S}_x\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by

$$dv_g(x, \theta) = |d\omega_x(\theta) \wedge d_g V| \tag{6.13}$$

where $d_g V$ is the Riemannian volume form on $\mathcal{M}$. By Lioville's theorem the form dv_g is preserved by the flow. The corresponding volume form on $\partial\mathcal{SM}$ is given by

$$d\sigma_g^{2n-2} = |d\omega_x(\theta) \wedge d_g\sigma| \tag{6.14}$$

where $d_g\sigma$ is the volume form of $\partial\mathcal{M}$

Let $L^2_\mu(\partial_+\mathcal{SM})$ be the space of real valued square integrable functions with respect to the measure $\mu(x, \theta) d_g\sigma^{2n-2}$ with density $\mu(x, \theta) = |\langle \theta, \nu(x)\rangle|$. The time independent X ray transform has the formally associated adjoint

$$I^* : L^2_\mu(\partial_+\mathcal{SM}) \to L^2(\mathcal{M}) \tag{6.15}$$

We have the following theorem about stability for the normal operator I^*I.

Theorem 8 (Theorem 3 in [34])**.** *Let $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ be a simple metric, we assume that $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ extends smoothly into a simple manifold such that $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$. Then there exists constants C_1, C_2 with $C_2 \geq C_1 > 0$ such that*

$$C_1 \left|\left|f(x)\right|\right|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq \left|\left|I^*If(x)\right|\right|_{H^1(\mathcal{M}_1)} \leq C_2 \left|\left|f(x)\right|\right|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \tag{6.16}$$

for any $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$.

If V is an open set of the simple Riemannian manifold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ the normal operator I^*I is an elliptic pseudo-differential operator of order -1 on V whose principle symbol is a multiple of $|\xi|_g^{-1}$. As a consequence, we can also reconstruct $f(x)$ locally in each coordinate chart on a simple manifold in a parametrix form

$$f(x) = CI^*X^{-1}g \tag{6.17}$$

with C a function of the volume of $\mathcal{M}$, and $g = If$. Essentially the same reconstruction formula applies.

7 Superposition Estimates

We are using a superposition of Gaussians as in [24]. We let $x(t,z)$ denote the nul-bicharacteristic curve with initial data $(z,\eta) \in T^*\mathcal{M}$. Let K be a compact (not necessarily proper) subset of $\mathcal{M}$. In particular we make the following definitions for the rest of this paper. We assume that the initial data for the Gaussian beam is of the following form:

$$u(0,y) = A(y)\exp(i\Phi(y)/h) \tag{7.1}$$

with $\Phi \in C^\infty(K,\mathbb{R})$, and $A(y) \in C_0^\infty(K,\mathbb{C})$. The first step is to pick the origin of the rays and the initial coefficients of ψ up to order 2. Letting the ray begin at the point z and expanding the amplitude of the phase $\Phi(y)$ in a Taylor series about this point, then we have

$$\Phi(y) = \sum_{|\beta|=0}^{2} \frac{1}{\beta!}\Phi_\beta(y)(y-z)^\beta + E \tag{7.2}$$

where E is the error associated to the Taylor series expansion. We initialize the ray and the Gaussian beam phase associated to the principle symbol as

$$x(0,z) = z \quad M(0,z) = \partial_y^2\Phi(z) + i\mathbb{I}_{n\times n} \quad p(0,z) = \nabla_y\Phi(z) \tag{7.3}$$

We now have $p(0,z) = \eta$ as in the notation of the previous section. We let $g(t,y,z)$ be the amplitude function $a(t,y)$ with initial data (z,η), in each local coordinate chart, and similarly for $\psi(t,y,z)$ so that

$$g(t,y,z)\exp(i\psi(t,y,z)/h) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} a_l(t,y)\exp(i\psi_l(t,y)/h) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} U_l(t,y) \tag{7.4}$$

The conditions of the previous theorem are then satisfied, and we can use the previously derived form of the beams in each coordinate chart to do the computations.

For a fixed $t \in [0,T]$ we let the Fourier integral operator be defined by

$$(Qw)(t,y) = h^{-n/2}\int_K w(z)g(t,y,z)\exp(i\psi(t,y,z)/h)\,dz. \tag{7.5}$$

We remark that as previously defined in any Euclidean neighborhood O_j which whose pre-image is a local coordinate chart the functions $g(t,y,z)$ and $\psi(t,y,z)$ and $x(t,z)$ satisfy for all $t \in [0,T]$, the following

1. $x(t,z) \in C^\infty([0,T]\times K)$
2. $\psi(t,y,z), g(t,y,z) \in C^\infty([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times K)$
3. $\nabla_y\psi(t,0,z)$ is real and there exists a constant C such that $\forall z,z' \in K$ we have

$$|\nabla_y\psi(t,0,z) - \nabla_y\psi(t,0,z')| + |x(t,z) - x(t,z')| \geq C|z-z'| \tag{7.6}$$

4. $\forall |y| \leq 2\eta_0$ η_0 sufficiently small, there exists a constant δ such that $\forall z \in K$, $\Im\psi(t,y,z) \geq \delta|y|^2$

5. We have that $\forall$ multi-indices $\beta, \exists C_\beta$ such that

$$\sup_{z\in K, y\in\mathbb{R}^n} |\partial_y^\beta g(t,y,z)| \leq C_\beta \tag{7.7}$$

It is a result of Theorems 3 and 4 in [24] that

Theorem 9. *The operator norm bound holds*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|Q\|_{L^2} \leq C(T) \tag{7.8}$$

where $C(T)$ depends uniformly on T and K. We also have for our approximation

$$\|Q(f)\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})} = \|f\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})) \tag{7.9}$$

for all $s \geq 0$.

As a result of the bounds in Theorem 9 they also prove the error estimates (5.25) also hold for Qf with the same accurracy as that of a standard Gaussian beam. We need the following lemma about super-positions of Gaussian beams. We recall the following elementary Lemmas

Lemma 7. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open, $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^∞, $p \in \Omega$ and $\nabla f(p) \neq 0$. Then there are neighborhoods U and V of 0 and p respectively and a C^∞ diffeomorphism $G : U \to V$ with $G(0) = p$ and*

$$f \circ G(x) = f(p) + x_n \tag{7.10}$$

We also see that

Lemma 8. *Let ϕ be a real valued C^∞ function and let v be a C_0^∞ function and define*

$$I(\lambda) = \int \exp(-\pi i \lambda \phi(x)) a(x) v(x)\, dx \tag{7.11}$$

here $\lambda > 0$ is a large scalar and $a(x) \in W^{N,1}(\Omega)$. Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open, $\phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is $C^\infty, p \in \Omega$ and $\nabla\phi(p) \neq 0$. Suppose that $v \in C_0^\infty$ has its support in a sufficiently small neighborhood of p then

$$\forall N, \exists C_n : |I(\lambda)| \leq C_N \lambda^{-N} \tag{7.12}$$

and furthermore C_N depends only on bounds for $N+1$ derivatives of ϕ, the $W^{N,1}(\Omega)$ norm of $a(x)$ and a lower bound for $|\nabla\phi(p)|$.

Proof. Let $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ G$ where G is a smooth diffeomorphism. Then we have

$$\int \exp(-\pi i \lambda \phi_2(x)) a(x) v(x)\, dx =$$
$$\int \exp(-\pi i \lambda \phi_1(G^{-1}x)) a(x) v(x)\, dx =$$
$$\int \exp(-\pi i \lambda \phi_1(y)) a(Gy) v(Gy) d(Gy) =$$
$$\int \exp(-\pi i \lambda \phi_1(y)) a(Gy) v(Gy) |J_G(y)|\, dy$$

where J_G is the Jacobian determinant. The straightening lemma and the calculation reduce this to the case where $\phi(x) = x_n + c$. In this case, letting $e_n = (0, ..., 0, 1)$ we have

$$I(\lambda) = \exp(-i\pi\lambda c) \hat{av}(\frac{\lambda}{2} e_n) \tag{7.13}$$

and this has the requiste decay as

$$\widehat{D^\alpha f}(\xi) = |\xi|^\alpha \hat{f}(\xi) \tag{7.14}$$

□

Now we define

$$\Delta x = \frac{x(t,z) - x(t,z')}{2} \tag{7.15}$$

and also

$$\tilde{\psi}(t,y,z,z') = \psi(t, y + \Delta x, z') - \overline{\psi}(t, y - \Delta x, z). \tag{7.16}$$

We have the following result from [24]

Lemma 9. *We have under the assumptions above that $\forall t \in [0,T]$ and y such that $|y \pm \Delta z| \leq 2\epsilon_1$ (with ϵ_1 being sufficiently small as in the section on Fermi coordinates) we have for all $z, z' \in K$, $\exists$ a constant δ which is independent of t such that*

1. *We have the bound on the phase*

$$\Im\tilde{\psi}(t,y,z,z') \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta[|y + \Delta x|^2 + |y - \Delta x|^2] = \delta|y|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\delta|x(t,z) - x(t,z')|^2 \tag{7.17}$$

for all $|x(t,z) - x(t,z')| \leq \Theta|z - z'|$, with Θ a positive constant.

2. *Now let $\mu < \epsilon_1$ be sufficiently small. We define the set*

$$\Omega(t,\mu) = \{y : |y - \Delta x| \leq 2\mu, |y + \Delta x| \leq 2\mu\} \tag{7.18}$$

then there exists a constant $C(\Theta,\mu)$ which is independent of t and positive in Θ such that

$$\inf_{y\in\Omega(t,\mu)} |\nabla_y \tilde{\psi}| \geq C(\Theta,\mu)|z-z'| \tag{7.19}$$

holds.

We also need the following Lemma on symplectic squeezing

Lemma 10. *Let S_t be a Hamiltonian flow map*

$$(x(t,z);p(t,z)) = S_t(x(0,z),p(0,z)) \tag{7.20}$$

associated to the Schrodinger operator. Let K_0 be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and assume that $p(0,z)$ is Lipschitz continuous in $z\in K_0$ for the flow associated to the Schrodinger operator. Under these conditions there exists positive constants c_1,c_2 depending T and δ such that

$$c_1|z-z'| \leq |p(t,z)-p(t,z')| + |x(t,z)-x(t,z')| \leq c_2|z-z'| \tag{7.21}$$

for all $z,z'\in K_0$ and $t\in[0,T]$.

If the variables z,z' are in disjoint charts, then the integral in y of $Q^*Qf(t,z)$ is 0 because of the defintion of support of the Gaussian beams approximation constructed in the previous section. Indeed, this is not difficult to see from the definition of $\chi_l(t,z)$ $\forall l=0,1...,L$.

We drop the subscript K, where it is understood. We let Q^* be the adjoint operator and we consider the squared expression

$$\begin{aligned} &Q^*Qf(t,z) = \\ &h^{-n}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n\times K} f(z')\exp(i\psi(t,y,z')/h)\overline{\exp(i\psi(t,y,z)/h)}g(t,y,z')\overline{g(t,y,z)}\,dy\,dz' = \\ &h^{-n}\int\limits_K I_g(t,z,z')f(z')\,dz' \end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

. We define the modified normal operator $\widetilde{Q^*Q}$ in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{Q^*Q}f(t,z) = \\ &h^{-n}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n\times K} f(z')\exp(ih^{-\epsilon}((\alpha(z)x(t,z)-\alpha(z')x(t,z'))\exp(i\psi(t,y,z')/h)\overline{\exp(i\psi(t,y,z)/h)}\times \\ &g(t,y,z')\overline{g(t,y,z)}\,dy\,dz' = h^{-n}\int\limits_K \tilde{I}_g(t,z,z')f(z')\,dz' \end{aligned} \tag{7.23}$$

We can now prove

Theorem 10. *We have that*

$$\widetilde{Q^*Q}f(t,z) = Ch^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2} f(x(t,z))(1+\mathcal{O}(h^{-1-\epsilon}\kappa_X(h))) + \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}) \quad (7.24)$$

holds in the sense of distributions as $h \to 0$, where $X = LL, LZ, Z$ depending on the regularity of α. Here C depends on diamO_j, and $\nabla_z(z\alpha(z))$.

Proof. As a consequence of Lemma 4, we have the equality

$$g(t,y,z) = g(x(t,z)) + \mathcal{O}(d_g(x,x(t,z)) \quad (7.25)$$

locally in each coordinate chart. We now start to analyze $\widetilde{Q^*Q}f$. We essentially work in Euclidean space knowing that we can map to it via the section on Fermi-coordinates.

The only stationary points in the integration are those for which $z = z', y = x(t,z')$. To see why this is true, we need to compute the total gradient of $\tilde{\psi}(t,y,z,z')$. Computing directly, we see that

$$(\nabla_y \tilde{\psi}, \nabla_{z'} \tilde{\psi}) = (0,0) \quad (7.26)$$

is satisfied is $z = z', y = x(t,z')$ when $d_{z'}x(t,z') = 0$, by direct substitution. We see that this critical point is degenerate. Taylor expanding the entire phase, and using (7.25) one obtains to leading order:

$$\int\limits_{|z-z'|<h^{\epsilon+1/2}} \exp(ih^{-\epsilon}(\nabla_{z'}(z\alpha(z))) \cdot (z-z'))\, dz' \times \int\limits_{y\in K} 1\, dy = Ch^{n(1+\epsilon)/2} \quad (7.27)$$

where C depends on the volume of K and $\nabla_{z'}(z\alpha(z))$. Evaluation of this integral requires $\nabla_{z'}(z\alpha(z))$ to be sign definite in the sense of distributions, otherwise there could be other stationary curves and it is impossible to isolate their contributions to the integral. We can discard the region where $|z-z'| > h^{\epsilon+1/2}$ by Lemma 9, and inequality (7.19).

Moreover, in the limit when $h \to 0$, this is the unique curve for which this yields a non-zero $\tilde{Q^*}Qf(t,z)$ in the limit. We argue by contradiction. Assume that $z \neq z'$ and $y = w(t,z,z')$ is another such curve. But then $g(t,y,z)$ and $g(t,y,z')$ must have $|x(t,z) - x(t,z')| < \sqrt{h}$ otherwise they have disjoint supports, by construction. Thefore essentially we must have $w(t,z,z') = x(t,z') + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h})$.

We need to examine the regularity of $\alpha(x)$ in order to make sense of the decay of the integral. In the sense of distributions we may approximate the Laplacian by a difference quotient and use the Zygmund or log-Zygmund regularity of α:

$$\Delta_g \alpha(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\alpha(x+he_j) + \alpha(x-he_j) - 2\alpha(x)}{h^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{h}\right) \leq C\kappa_X(h)h^{-2}. \quad (7.28)$$

Here e_j is a standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and we recall we are allowed to take $g_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$, by using the local coordinate charts which cover the tube and then mapping to $\mathbb{R}^n$. We do not use this estimate here, but we use its implication for the first order derivatives. We remark that it can be used to show that the higher the regularity of the coefficients, the better the approximate solution can be made. The definition of Frechet differentiability holds and makes sense here because of the regularity of α. The conditions of Zygmund and log-Zygmund differentiability also imply

$$|\nabla_g \alpha - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\alpha(x + he_j) - \alpha(x)}{h}| \leq Ch^{-1}\kappa_X(h) \tag{7.29}$$

as $h \to 0$ in the sense of distributions, where C depends only on α^*. Using stationary phase with $N = 1$, and the regularity of $\alpha(x)$ yields the desired conclusion. □

Because the coefficients are of extremely low regularity, we start with building an explict weak solution to the wave equation. The main idea is to construct a weak Ansatz for the wave equation of the form

$$\Pi U_h(t, x) = \exp(ih^{-1/2-\epsilon/2}t)\Pi\phi(x) \ , \tag{7.30}$$

with $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\Pi = I^*X^{-1}$ a bounded operator on a weighted $L^2(\partial_+ \mathcal{SM})$ space, as defined in Section 6 and

$$\phi(x) = \int_0^T \widetilde{Q^*Q} f(s, z)\, ds \ . \tag{7.31}$$

locally in every coordinate chart. $Qf(t, x)$ is an integral superposition of Gaussian beams as per [24], and $\tilde{Q^*Q}$ is the modified normal operator from the previous section. The function $U(t, x)$ is a Gaussian beam which accurately approximates a true solution to the Schrodinger equation

$$ih\partial_t u(t, x) = \frac{1}{2}h^2\Delta_g u(t, x) \ . \tag{7.32}$$

We use the subscript $'h'$ to distinguish this approximation from the approximation the wave equation U_h defined above. For such $U(t, x)$, when $\alpha(x)$ is in Zygmund class, we show below that $\phi(x)$ satisfies

$$|\langle \Delta\phi(x) + h^{-1-\epsilon}\alpha(x)\phi(x), \varphi(x)\rangle_{\mathcal{M}}| \leq \mathcal{O}(h^{-1-\epsilon}\kappa_X(h)h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}) \tag{7.33}$$

for some $\varphi(x)$ a $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ test function. An analgous result holds for $\alpha(x)$ which is log Zygmund. This is in direct analogy to contruction of an exact quasimode found in [12]. The entire function U_h in L^2 norm can be estimated via a good kernel argument as $h \to 0$ which will then lead to an Xray transform of the initial data. We can then show that (7.31) solves the wave equation in the weak sense and use a standard density argument to arrive at the observability estimates.

8 Quasimodes

Consider the Gaussian beam $U_l(s,x)$ as in the previous section. We study it in local coordinate charts and prove the relevant estimates there. Let $K = \mathcal{M}$ which we suppress. Let us define

$$\int_{t_{l-1}}^{t_{l+1}} \widetilde{Q^*Q} f(s,x)\, ds = \phi_l(x)\ . \tag{8.1}$$

We know that

$$< \Pi\phi_l(x), \varphi(x) >_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \tag{8.2}$$

exists and is well defined if $\varphi(x) \in S(\mathcal{M})$. Because $\alpha(x)$ is bounded, we know that $\phi_l(x) \in L^1_{loc}(O_l)$. The action of the operator Π on S' is bounded, which follows by Proposition 10.5 and Theorem 11, in [11].

We claim that ϕ_l is a (bad) quasimode.

Lemma 11. *Let $\varphi(x) \in S(O_l)$ The function $\phi_l(x)$ satisfies*

$$\langle \Pi(-h^2\Delta_g\phi_l - h^{1-\epsilon}\alpha\phi_l), \frac{\varphi}{\alpha}\rangle_{L^2(O_l)} \leq Ch^{1-\epsilon}h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}\kappa_X(h)\, ||f(x)||_{H^1(O_l)} \tag{8.3}$$

in every open set O_l, as defined previously. C is a constant depending only on the metric g and $\mathrm{diam}_g(O_l)$.

Proof. We transfer to local coordinates, since the Fermi coordinates everywhere in the previous section are well-defined in a neighborhood of the tube. Again, because $\alpha(x)$ is bounded, we know that $\phi_l(x) \in L^1_{loc}(O_l)$, we know that (8.3) exists and is well-defined by Prop 10.5 and Theorem 11 in [11]. We can commute the differentiation in x under the integrals in the construction of the operator $\tilde{Q^*Q}$ because $\tilde{Q^*Q}$ amounts to integration in the other variables. We compute in the sense of distributions under the t integral sign in the definition of ϕ_l:

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(-ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha s - i\psi h^{-1})(\Delta_g(\exp(ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha s)U_l)) = \\ h^{-2}|\nabla_g\psi|^2 + \Delta_g(a_0\chi_l) + ih^{-\epsilon}\Delta_g\alpha s + ih^{-\epsilon}2s\nabla_g(i\psi h^{-1})\nabla_g\alpha + \\ 2\nabla_g(a_0\chi_l)\nabla_g(i\psi h^{-1}) + ih^{-\epsilon}2s\nabla_g(a_0\chi_l)\nabla_g\alpha\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

By construction, see (5.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_g\psi_l|^2 + \partial_s\psi_l = \mathcal{O}(d_g^3(x,x(s)))\ , \\ \partial_s a + 2\nabla_g\psi\cdot\nabla_g a + \frac{a}{2}\Delta_g\psi = \mathcal{O}(d_g(x,x(s))\ ,\end{aligned}$$

One can arrange that $|\nabla^m\chi_h(x)| \leq Ch^{-m/2}$, and $|\partial_s\chi_j(s,x)| \leq Ch^{-1/2}$ by (4.6) for a bounded C independent of h. Grouping terms appropriately, by definition

of the support of the cutoffs, we see

$$h^2 \int_{t_{l-1}}^{t_{l+1}} (\Delta_g(\exp(ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha s)U_l))\, ds = ih \int_{t_{l-1}}^{t_{l+1}} (\partial_s U_l) \exp(ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha(x)s)\, ds + \mathcal{O}(h^{1-\epsilon}\kappa_X(h)) \ . \tag{8.5}$$

The desired result follows by integration by parts in s.

The leftover terms from applying the operator $h^2\Delta_g + h^{1-\epsilon}\alpha(x)$ to the $\phi_l(x)$ with terms (8.5) are now

$$h^2 \left(\exp(ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha s + i\psi h^{-1})\right) \left(ih^{-\epsilon}\Delta_g \alpha s + ih^{-\epsilon} 2s\nabla_g(i\psi h^{-1})\nabla_g \alpha + ih^{-\epsilon} 2s\nabla_g(a_0\chi_l)\nabla_g \alpha\right) \tag{8.6}$$

The last two terms in (8.6), we re-arrange.

$$\left(\exp(ih^{-\epsilon}\alpha s + i\psi h^{-1})\right) (ih^{-\epsilon} 2s\nabla_g(i\psi h^{-1})\nabla_g \alpha + ih^{-\epsilon} 2s\nabla_g(a_0\chi_l)\nabla_g \alpha) = \tag{8.7}$$

$$(\nabla_g \alpha)(\nabla_g U_l)$$

We need to show that when we consider the contribution from (8.6), then these terms are are bounded by $Ch^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}h^{1-\epsilon}\kappa_X(h)\,||f(x)||_{H^1(O_l)}$. By (7.29) and (8.7), it suffices to show the following Lemma

Lemma 12. *Let $f(x) \in H^1(\mathcal{M})$. We have the following inequality:*

$$| < \Pi[\int_0^T \nabla_x \tilde{Q^*} Q f(s,x)\, ds, \varphi(x) >_{L^2(O_l)} | \leq Ch^{-1-\epsilon}h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}\kappa_X(h)\,||f(x)||_{H^1(O_l)} \tag{8.8}$$

for all h sufficiently small, where C depends on diam(O_l), α^*, and α_0.

Proof. This follows as a slight modification of Theorem 9, noting the required bounds on $\alpha(x)$ in the sense of distributions. □

The application of this estimate combined with the regularity of $\alpha(x)$ gives the desired result. We recall that for the $\Delta_g\alpha(x)$ terms we can integrate by parts once to move the differentiation onto the $U_l(s,x)$ in each coordinate chart since $U_l(s,x)$ is a smooth function in x, this integration by parts makes sense. By the estimate (7.28), we see that the higher regularity in $\alpha(x)$, for instance a C^2 bound would make the error estimates for our approximate better. □

Define $\phi(x)$ as the full approximate solution on the manifold

$$\sum_{l=0}^{L} \phi_l(x) = \phi(x). \tag{8.9}$$

We need to show that $\phi(x)$ is dominated in L^2 norm by its diagonal parts. We notice that, for $\beta = 0, 1, 2$ we have the following equality

$$\langle \nabla_g^\beta \phi(x), \varphi(x) \rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{L} \langle \nabla_g^\beta \phi_l(x), \varphi(x) \rangle. \tag{8.10}$$

where $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. Our quasimode now badly approximates the true solution to the generalized Helmholtz equation on $\mathcal{M}$ in each local coordinate chart as we showed via standard energy estimates.

9 Error Estimates for Wave

This section is adapted from Lemma 4.1 in [4]. Let $\Box_g = \alpha(x)\partial_t^2 - \Delta_g$ denote the wave operator as described in the Introduction. Let $\Pi = I^* X^{-1}$ be the operator defined in Section 6. We claim:

Lemma 13. *The wave equation:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Box_g u = 0 \qquad & in \qquad (0,T) \times \mathcal{M} \\ u(t,x) = f(x) \qquad \partial_t u(t,x) = 0 \qquad & at \qquad x \in \mathcal{M}, t = 0 \end{aligned}$$

has a weak solution of the form

$$u(t,x) = \Pi U_h(t,x) + v(t,x)$$

where $v(t,x)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} v(t,x) = 0 \qquad & in \qquad (0,T) \times \partial\mathcal{M} \\ v(t,x) = 0 \qquad \partial_t v(t,x) = 0 \qquad & x \in \mathcal{M}, t = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and $\forall \varphi(t,x) \in C_0^\infty((0,T) \times \mathcal{M})$

$$\begin{aligned} | < v(t,x), \varphi(t,x) >_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} | &\leq C h^{(-1/2-\epsilon/2)} h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2} \kappa_X(h) \, ||f(x)||_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \\ | < \nabla_g v(t,x), \varphi(t,x) >_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} | &\leq C h^{(-1/2-\epsilon/2)} h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2} \kappa_X(h) \, ||f(x)||_{H^2(\mathcal{M})} \end{aligned}$$

We set $k(t,x) = \Box_g(u - \Pi U_h)$. To prove the Lemma it suffices to show that if v solves

$$\begin{aligned} \Box_g v(t,x) = k(t,x) \qquad & (9.1) \\ v(t,x) = \partial_t v(t,x) = 0 \qquad \text{at} \qquad x \in \mathcal{M}, \qquad t = 0 & \\ v(t,x) = 0 \qquad (0,T) \times \partial\mathcal{M} & \end{aligned}$$

then the estimates hold. We then know from Lemma 11 in Section 7

$$k(t,x) = \exp(ih^{(-1-\epsilon)/2} t) k_0(t,x)$$

with

$$| < k_0(t,x), \varphi(t,x) >_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} | \leq Ch^{(-1-\epsilon)}h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}\kappa_X(h)\,||f(x)||_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \tag{9.2}$$

The error term in Lemma 11, (8.3) is $k_0(t,x)$ by construction. It follows that the function

$$w(t,x) = \int_0^t v(s,x)\,ds$$

solves the hyperbolic problem (9.1), with right hand side

$$k_1(t,x) = \int_0^t k(s,x)\,ds = -ih^{(1+\epsilon)/2}\int_0^t k_0(s,x)\partial_s(\exp(ih^{(-1-\epsilon)/2}s)\,ds \tag{9.3}$$

the desired result follows via (9.2) and the identity

$$< \partial_t w(t,x), \varphi(t,x) >_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} = < v(t,x), \varphi(t,x) >_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} \tag{9.4}$$

An analogous statement is true for the manifold case, with initial data dictated by the stability estimates for the X-ray transform. Applying Lemma 12 and the definition of Π as an identity operator on the ray transform gives us convergence of the initial data, whence the desired result.

10 Observability estimates

In this section we prove the main theorems on observability estimates. Because we are unable to construct an exact solution to the Helmholtz equation, we must keep track of errors more carefully than in [12]. We compute locally in every coordinate chart near the boundary. In the Fermi coordinates near the boundary we know that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \partial_\nu \Pi U_h(t,x)\varphi(t,x)\,d_gV\,dt \tag{10.1}$$

This is an approximation to the integrand for

$$\int_0^T \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \partial_\nu u(t,x)\varphi(t,x)\,d_gV\,dt \tag{10.2}$$

in local coordinates near the boundary. Again, $\varphi(t,x)$ is a $S([0,T]\times\mathcal{M})$ test function. Because $|\exp(iht)| = 1$, we use the solution $\phi_l(t,x)$ near the boundary. Indeed, the imaginary part of the exponential does not affect the computation of

the integrand. As a super-position of solutions this approximation is accurate to approximate normal derivative of a solution to the wave equation up to $\mathcal{O}(h^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}\kappa_X(h))$ via standard energy estimates, see for example Lemma 4.1 of [4]. The error estimates are outlined previously. This estimate is where we need $\epsilon < 1$ otherwise there is no asymptotic parameter, so the error estimates do not go to zero in the limit where $h \to 0$ in the case of Zygmund coefficients.

We have the following lemma, which relates the boundary observability estimate to the X-ray transform:

Lemma 14. *Let $\alpha(x)$ belong to the Zygmund class. We consider $\varphi(t,x)$ to smoothly approximate $\partial_\nu f(x)$ on the cylinder $[0,T]$. We then have the integral observability constant is given by*

$$h^{n(1-\epsilon)/2}|\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{U}_l} \partial_\nu \Pi U_h(t,x)\varphi(t,x)\,dx\,dt| = \|\partial_\nu f\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-1/2-\epsilon/2}\kappa_X(h))\|f(x)\|^2_{H^2(\mathcal{M})}\ , \tag{10.3}$$

where I denotes the X-ray transform, and C depends on T and $diam_g(\mathcal{M})$.

This Lemma is one place where we use the assumption $T > 2T_\alpha$ so the right hand side of (10.3) exists and is well-defined. We start by approximating the inner products of the solutions in each local coordinate chart. In local coordinates $\partial_\nu = \partial_{x_1}$ and $x_1 = r$, so that

$$|\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{U}_l\cap\partial\mathcal{M}} (\partial_{x_1}\Pi U_h(t,x))\varphi(t,x)\,dx\,dt| \geq C|\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{U}_l\cap\partial\mathcal{M}} (\Pi U_h(t,x))\partial_{x_1}\varphi(t,x)\,dx\,dt|$$

We see that by Lemma 12 and the estimates on $\nabla\alpha$, given by (7.29),

$$h^{n(1-\epsilon)/2}|< \Pi U_h, \partial_\nu\varphi(t,x) > | = | < \partial_\nu f(x), \partial_\nu f(x) > | + h^{-1/2-\epsilon/2}\kappa_X(h)||f(x)||_{H^2(\mathcal{M})} \tag{10.4}$$

as $h \to 0$, with $\varphi(t,x)$ smoothly approximating $\partial_\nu f(x)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. From the Lemma on the integral observability estimate, Lemma 14, we have a lower bound on the approximate solution. Moreover we have that

$$| < \partial_\nu \Pi U_h, \varphi(t,x) > | \leq h^{-n(1-\epsilon)/2}\|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})}\|\partial_\nu f\|_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})} \tag{10.5}$$

by the well-posedeness estimates for the approximate solution to the wave equation and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Combining these estimates, (10.3) and (10.5), and cancelling powers $||\partial_\nu f||_{L^2((0,T)\times\mathcal{M})}$ we have the desired result with $u_1(x) \equiv 0$. In order to include terms with $u_1(x)$, one would have to build an Ansatz of the following form:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\exp(ih^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}) + \exp(-ih^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}))\Pi U_h^0 + \tag{10.6}$$

$$\frac{1}{2ih^{(1+\epsilon)/2}}(\exp(ih^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}) - \exp(-ih^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}))\Pi U_h^1 \tag{10.7}$$

with the superscript 0 and 1 denoting a solution built with $\phi(x)$ with initial data $u_0(x)$ and $u^1(x)$ respectively. □

Proof of Theorem 3. The modification from the above is easy, we need to note that $\Pi U_h(t,x)$ is an approximation which accurate to approximate normal derivative of a solution to the wave equation up to $\mathcal{O}(h^{-(1+\epsilon)/2}\kappa_X(h))$ times a relative error. Again the differentiation in ∂_t is only needed to counteract the extra logarithm factor in $\kappa_X(h)$ when $X = LZ$ or LL, and we see this specifically in estimate (9.3). A limit of $\epsilon \to 1$ gives better convergence of integrals and conservation of energy. □

Acknowledgments

A. W. acknowledges support by EPSRC grant EP/L01937X/1 and ERC Advanced Grant MULTIMOD 26718. She wishes to thank Semyon Dyatlov for interesting discussions, and Yaroslav Kurylev for helping with the presentation of this article.

References

[1] G. Alessandrini and J. Sylvester, *Stability for a multidimensional inverse spectral theorem*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 15(5) (1990), 711-736.

[2] G. Bao and H. Zhang, *Sensitivity analysis of an inverse problem for the wave equation with caustics*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 27 (2014), 953-981.

[3] C. Bardos, G. Lebeau and J. Rauch, *Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilization of waves from the boundary*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 30 (1992), 1024-1065.

[4] M. Bellasoued, and D. Dos Santos Ferreira. *Stability estimates for the anisotropic wave equation from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.* Inverse Probl. Imaging 5(4) (2011) 745-773

[5] M. Bellasoued, and D. Dos Santos Ferreira. *Stable determination of coefficients in the dynamical anisotropic Schrdinger equation from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map* Inverse Problems, Vol. 26, No. 12 , (2010).

[6] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, M. Salo, Y. Kurlyev, M. Lassas *The Caldern problem in transversally anisotropic geometries.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (to appear).

[7] N. Burq, *Controlabilite exacte des ondes dans des ouverts peu reguliers*, Asymptot. Anal. 14 (1997), 157-191.

[8] C. Castro and E. Zuazua, *Concentration and lack of observability of waves in highly heterogeneous media*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 164 (2002), 39-72. Addendum: Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 185 (2007), 365-377.

[9] S. Dyatlov and A. Waters *Lower Resolvent Bounds and Lyapunov Estimates* http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.04051 (2015).

[10] L. Evans. *Partial differential equations.* Providence, R.I.: American Mathematical Society. (1998), 257261.

[11] G. Eskin *Lectures on Linear Partial Differential Equations* Graudate Studies in Mathematics. Volume 123 American Mathematical Society, Providence Rhode Island (2011).

[12] F. Fanelli and E. Zuazua, *Weak observability estimates for 1-D wave equations with rough coefficients*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire 32 (2015), 245-277.

[13] E. Fernandez-Cara and E. Zuazua, *On the null controllability of the one-dimensional heat equation with BV coefficients*, Comput. Appl. Math. 21 (2002), 167-190.

[14] A. Gray, *Tubes*, Advanced Book Progam, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, New York, 1990.

[15] L. Hormander *Fourier Integral operators.* I. Acta. Math., 127(1-2): 79-183, 1971.

[16] L. Hormander *The analysis of linear partial differential operators, III.* Pseudo Differential Operators. Springer, Berlin, 1994.

[17] S. Helgason, *The Radon Transform* 2nd. Ed. Birkhauser (1999)

[18] A. E. Hurd and D. H. Sattinger, *Questions of existence and uniqueness for hyperbolic equations with discontinuous coefficients*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 132 (1968), 159-174.

[19] V. Isakov *An inverse hyperbolic problem with many boundary measurements* Comm. Partial Differential equations 16(6-7) (1991) 1183-1195.

[20] V. Isakov and Z. Qi Sun *Stability estimates for hyperbolic inverse problems with local boudnary data* Inverse Problems 8(2) (1992) 193-206.

[21] C. Kenig and M. Salo, *The Calderon problem with partial data on manifolds and applications*, Analysis & PDE 6 (2013), 2003-2048.

[22] J.B. Keller. *Correct borh-Sommerfield quantum conditions for nonseperatble systems.* Ann. Physics, 4:180-188, 1958.

[23] V. Krishnan *A support theorem for the geodesic ray transform on functions.* J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 15 (2009) 515-520.

[24] H. Liu, O. Runborg and N. M. Tanushev. *Error estimates for Gaussian beam superpositions.* Math. Comp. 82:919-952, (2013).

[25] A. Katchalov, Y. Kurylev, and M. Lassas. *Inverse bound- ary spectral problems*, volume 123 of Chapman and Hall/CRC Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2001.

[26] V. P. Maslov and M. V. Fedoriuk. *Semiclassical approximation in quantum mechanics* Volume 7 of Mathematical Physics and Applied Mathematics. D. Riedel Publishing Co., Dordecht, 1981. Translated from the Russian by J. Niederle and J. Tolar, Contemporary Mathematics, 5.

[27] C. Montalto *Stable determination of a simple metric, a co-vector field and a potential from the hyperbolic dirichlet-to-neumann map* Comm. Partial Differential equations 39 (2014).

[28] F. Natterer and F. Ẃubbeling. *Mathematical methods in image reconstruction.* SIAM Monographs on Mathematical Modeling and Computation. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2001.

[29] Rakesh. *Reconstruction for an inverse problem for the wave equation with constant velocity* Inverse Problems 6(1) (1990) 91-98.

[30] Rakesh and W. Symes. *Uniqueness for an inverse problem for the wave equaiton* Comm. Partial Differential equations 13(1) (1988) 87-96.

[31] J. Ralston. *Gaussian beams and the propagation of singularities* MAA Stud. Math vol 23 Math Assoc. of America (1982) 206-248

[32] A. Ramm and J. Sjostrand. *An inverse problem of the wave equation.* Math. Z. 206(1) (1991) 119-130

[33] P. Stefanov *Uniqueness of the multi-dimensional inverse scattering problem for time-dependent potentials* Math. Z. 201 (1994) 541-559

[34] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. *Stable determination of generic simple metrics from the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map* Int. Math. Res. Not. 17 (2005) 1047-1061.

[35] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. *Stability estimates for the X-ray transform of tensor fields and boundary irgidity* Duke Math. J. 123(4) (2004) 445-467.

[36] G. Uhlmann and A. Vasy *The inverse problem for the local geodesic ray transform.* Inventiones (to appear)

[37] A. Waters, *A parametrix construction for the wave equation with low regularity coefficients using a frame of Gaussians*, Commun. Math. Sci. 9 (2011), 225 - 254.

[38] A. Waters, *Stable determination of X-ray transforms of time-dependent potentials from partial boundary data*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 12 (2014), 2169-2197.

[39] A. Waters, *Phaseless Stability for Helmholtz* UCLA CAM reports 14-98 (2014).

[40] L. Ying and J. Qian, *Fast multiscale Gaussian wavepacket transform and multiscale Gaussian beams for the wave equation*, SIAM Multiscale Modeling and Simulation 8 (2010), 7848-7873.